Sl.	Name of RRBs	Total Loans issued		Total Loans Outstanding	
		1999-2000	2000-2001	1999-2000	2000-2001
8	Dewas Shajpur Ksh. Gramin Bank	1998.15	2745.83	5773.57	5951.22
9	Nimar Ksh. Gramin Bank	2007.53	3126.69	5721.59	6632.48
10	Mandla Balaghat Ksh. Gramin Bank	499.15	725.03	1691.61	2206.84
11	Chhindwara Seoni Ksh. Gramin Bank	1681.58	1823.62	4136.00	4947.80
12	Rajgarh Sehore Ksh. Gramin Bank	1826.81	2147.26	3907.81	4879.76
13	Shahdol Ksh. Gramin Bank	483.65	775.71	1617.93	1750.51
14	Ratlam Mandsaur Ksh. Gramin Bank	1649.87	1611.58	3241.13	3765.64
15	Chambal Ksh. Gramin Bank	2678.82	2319.25	4318.78	5122.12
16	Mahakaushal Ksh. Gramin Bank	313.35	670.57	1000.10	1589.75
17	Indore Ujjain Ksh. Gramin Bank	1550.75	1392.21	3148.50	3218.36
18	Gwalior Datia Ksh. Gramin Bank	859.18	1287.82	2466.18	3366.54
19	Vidisha Bhopal Kshetriya Gramin Bank	1265.03	1570.61	3572.70	4764.85
	TOTAL:	**30726.48**	**37926.82**	**76771.90**	**88504.03**

Note : Ksh = Kshetriya

Order issued against SBI by securities and Exchange Commission of USA

2149. PROF. RAM DEO BHANDARY: Will the Ministerof FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Securities and Exchange Commission in USA has issued "cease and desist" order against the State Bank of India;

(b) if so, the reasons for issuing such adverse order against our prestigious national bank;

(c) whether any appeal/protest has been lodged by the bank against the said order;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ANANT GANGARAM GEETE): (a) Yes, Sir. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) in USA had issued a 'Cease and Desist' (C and D) order against State Bank of India (SBI) on 19th November, 2001.

(b) The C and D Order was issued for marketing Resurgent India Bonds (RIBs) in USA without filing a registration statement with the Commission in terms of Section 5 of the Securities Act. SBI reportedly did not register the RIBs with the commission as it considered RIBs as deposits, whereas the Commission took the view that the RIBs were securities which needed to be registered with the Commission before their marketing in USA.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) SBI did not prefer an appeal as no monetary payment was levied and the RIB issue was already over.

Majority holding in ARCIL

2150. SHRI RAJKUMAR DHOOT: Will the Minister of FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Asset Reconstruction Company (India) Ltd. (ARCIL) to tackle bad debts of banks and financial institutions has been allowed majority holding and management by private sector;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the reasons as to why it could not function as a public sector undertaking with full Government and legal backing;

(d) what advantages have been contemplated to keep ARCIL in the private sector; and

(e) the safe guards taken to ensure that ARCIL does not exceed its brief in recovering the debts?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ANANT GANGARAM GEETE): (a) to (e) Government has promulgated an Ordinance, "The Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest